

Katherine Douglas *Public Comment - CLUE LWVSB*

1



From: Gail Osherenko <gail.osherenko@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 1:26 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Pamela Flynt Tambo; Tanja Heitman; Larry Severance; Joan Hartmann; Laura Capps; Das Williams; Steve Lavagnino; Supervisor Nelson
Subject: Re: Truth Act - Dec 17 Bd of Supervisors meeting - Agenda item 24-01300
Attachments: TruthActLetter.CLUELWVSB.12.15.2024.pdf

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerk, Board of Supervisors, et al.
This is to clarify that the letter to the Board filed yesterday pertains to the **Dec. 17** Board of Supervisors' meeting, item D-1 regarding the Truth Act.
I have attached again the letter from our joint LWVSB/CLUE-SB Criminal Justice workgroup regarding this issue. Please include it in the record.

Thank you
Gail Osherenko

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Laurence Severance <laurenceseverance@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Dec 15, 2024 at 11:46 AM
Subject: December 18 Board of Supervisors meeting - Agenda item 24-01300 TRUTH Act Report
To: <sbcob@countyofsb.org>
Cc: Gail Osherenko <gail.osherenko@gmail.com>, Pamela Flynt Tambo <pambotambo@gmail.com>

Dear Clerk,
Please circulate the attached public comment letter to Supervisors ahead of their December 18, 2024 meeting. This letter is submitted on behalf of Clergy & Laity United for Economic Justice - Santa Barbara; and the League of Women Voters - Santa Barbara combined Criminal Justice Workgroup.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Thank you,
Laurence Severance
for CLUE-SB/LWV-SB
(206) 250-5855 (cell)



CLUE (Clergy & Laity United for Economic Justice) Santa Barbara

December 15, 2024

Board of Supervisors
Santa Barbara County
c/o sbcob@countyofsb.org

re: Agenda Item 24-01300: TRUTH Act Report of Sheriff's Department

Dear Supervisors:

This public comment is submitted for and on behalf of CLUE-Santa Barbara (Clergy & Laity United for Economic Justice – Santa Barbara) and the League of Women Voters of Santa Barbara's combined Criminal Justice Workgroup. Our two organizations have studied criminal justice in our County and reflect the views of many residents who are members of faith communities that support CLUE or who engage with the League of Women Voters to become educated and express support for sound public policy.

This letter addresses public concerns we have concerning the Sheriff Office's actual or perceived cooperation with ICE (Immigration & Customs Enforcement), especially in light of President-elect Trump's recently announced "mass deportation" intentions.

**MISDIRECTED USE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES
IS NOT FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE**

1. **Public Safety is Sheriff Brown's primary mission.** Protecting public safety is supposed to enable all community members to carry on activities of daily living without threat of violence or property loss. Undocumented immigrants who live in our community, may or may not be guilty of a "status offense", but are indistinguishable from anyone else in regard to needs for public safety. **Undocumented immigrants per se, do not threaten public safety and should be of no concern for the Sheriff's Department.**

2. Involvement of the Sheriff's Office in ICE transfers opens Santa Barbara County to potential civil liability because the risk of error is high. The Immigrant Legal Defense Center (ILDC) raised this point in our recent conversation with its Executive Director. We generally concur with the concerns raised by ILDC.

Requested action: No County resources or dollars allocated for the Sheriff's budget should be used to identify or transmit information relating to a person's undocumented status. The County should require an accurate accounting and reduce or recoup from the Sheriff's budget any amounts, from whatever source, expended for that purpose.

COMMUNITY INTEGRITY AND WELL-BEING.

3. **Sheriff's Office cooperation or collaboration with ICE, whether active or passive, undermines its own integrity in our community and diminishes its ability to protect public safety.** Federal law designates ICE, not our Sheriff, to enforce immigration laws and policies. Our County government, including the Sheriff's Department, has no responsibility for enforcing federal immigration law, nor should it participate in doing so.

The Sheriff's Department undermines its own mission and actually jeopardizes public safety by actively, or passively, cooperating with ICE. *Actual or perceived* cooperation between the Sheriff's Department and ICE creates mistrust and undermines the credibility of law enforcement for families, neighborhoods and communities who live in peace with undocumented immigrants. Fear of communicating with law enforcement because of its perceived cooperation with ICE, results in crimes going unreported and unsolved. Legal residents and undocumented immigrants choose to endure injury and loss rather than risk the potential removal of undocumented loved ones or co-workers who may be victims or witnesses to crime. Crime-caused injuries and losses due to under-reporting for fear of removal, fall disproportionately on Latinx residents who now comprise about 40% of our County population.

4. As a matter of due process and fundamental fairness, transfers to ICE inflict double punishment. People who have been granted relief by a judge and/or complied with judicially ordered conditions, are being subjected to double punishment and discrimination on the basis of undocumented status.

SB 54 does not require the Sheriff to cooperate with ICE. The purpose of SB 54 is to limit cooperation. The Sheriff's choice to find ways to cooperate with ICE elevates his own priorities but undermines trust among vulnerable communities. Facilitating the transfer to ICE of people who have not been convicted of crimes that require it, hurts the community, rather than helping it.

5. Cooperating with ICE undermines restorative processes within our County's legal system. Those transferred to ICE are deprived of holistic, sustainable solutions. Instead, undocumented status becomes a fast track to re-incarceration and double punishment.

Requested action: County Supervisors should develop and pass a clear policy statement, as other local governmental leaders have done, to explicitly clarify and reinforce the boundaries between paid-for public safety efforts vs. activities that, while legal, undermine credibility and the success of law enforcement in protecting public safety. County policy should mandate that the priority for the Sheriff's Department is to focus on public safety duties and drop unnecessary activities that undermine law enforcement integrity by raising doubts about its purpose.

Other counties with large immigrant populations (Los Angeles County; San Diego County) have made clear policy decisions that it is in their residents' best interests not to cooperate with ICE. San Diego County Supervisors affirmed a policy that: "... the County shall not provide assistance or cooperation to ICE in its civil immigration enforcement efforts, including by giving ICE agents access to individuals or allowing them to use County facilities for investigative interviews or other purposes, expending County time or resources responding to ICE inquiries or communicating with ICE regarding individuals' incarceration status or release dates, or otherwise participating in any civil immigration enforcement activities." Santa Barbara Co. Supervisors should consider adopting a similar policy.

Respectfully submitted,

CLUE- Santa Barbara
Criminal Justice Workgroup
s/ Laurence Severance
By: Laurence Severance,

League of Women Voters – Santa Barbara
Criminal Justice Workgroup
s/ Gail Osherenko
By: Gail Osherenko

League of Women Voters' of Santa
Barbaras Leadership Team
s/ Pam Flynt Tambo
By: Pam Flynt Tambo